

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 26, 2008. Claims 19, 22, 23, 26 and 28 to 33 are pending in the application, of which Claims 19, 26, 28 and 31 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Without conceding the correctness of the rejection, Applicants have amended the claims to clarify that through indication of a predetermined value, the data processing apparatus is controlled so that one of the resources is not displayed.. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 19 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,825,941 (Nguyen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,603,565 (Scheidig). Dependent Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nguyen in view of Scheidig and further in view of U.S. Published Appln. No. 2003/0072030 (Haines). Dependent Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Nguyen, Haines and Scheidig, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,869 (Forstall). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 19 is directed to a data processing apparatus, which communicates with an image processing apparatus that processes image data by using resources retained in memory. The apparatus includes retention means for retaining resources which are utilized in image processing, and setting means for setting display names of a resource for each of the resources retained by the retention means.

The display names set for each of the resources are different for different print languages used in the image processing apparatus.

In contrast, Nguyen discloses that standard printer properties may be included on layout and property sheets, as illustrated in Fig. 8 of Nguyen. The driver UI displays the printer features, checks on installed options, and allow users to select only the installed options. Thus, Nguyen teaches selection of print settings for installed options from a driver GUI. As the Examiner states, Nguyen does not disclose setting display name information for the print languages.

Furthermore, Scheidig discloses a sequence for initializing a printer. In the disclosed procedure, an operator inputs machine-dependent data such as paper width and length at a control panel, then inputs all setting data for different printer languages suitable for the machine-dependent data. Fig. 2b of Scheidig shows a corresponding table of printer languages. Thus, Scheidig merely discloses a setting interface for setting values for different printer languages.

Accordingly, Nguyen and Scheidig, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest setting means for setting display names of a resource for each of the resources retained by the retention means, wherein the display names set for each of the resources are different for different print languages used in an image processing apparatus. In other words, the cited documents fail to disclose or suggest that for each resource different display names may be set for different print languages.

At least two advantages are achieved through utilization of the present invention, in part due to the described feature of setting different display names for different print languages for each resource. First, memory consumption may be saved when a resource is shared by print

languages, since it is not required that the resource be prepared for each print language. Second, a resource shared by print languages can be displayed as if different resources are prepared for respective print languages.

In light of the deficiencies of Nguyen and Scheidig as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 19 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 26 is directed to a data processing apparatus using specified retention and setting units, substantially in accordance with the apparatus, retention and setting means of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 26 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 28 is directed to a data processing method substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 28 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claim 31 is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a computer program substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 19. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 31 is also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.